



# BOLSHEVISM AND THE WEST



# BOOKS BY BERTRAND RUSSELL



Introduction to Mathematical Philosophy

The Analysis of Mind

Scientific Method of Philosophy

Mysticism and Logic

Roads to Freedom

Principles of Social Reconstruction

Free Thought and Official Propaganda

Our Knowledge of the External World

The Problem of China

A Free Man's Worship

Icarus

A. B. C. of Atoms

Justice in War Time

# BOLSHEVISM AND THE WEST

A DEBATE ON THE RESOLUTION  
"THAT THE SOVIET FORM OF GOVERNMENT  
IS APPLICABLE TO WESTERN CIVILIZATION"

SCOTT NEARING

AFFIRMATIVE

BERTRAND RUSSELL

NEGATIVE

INTRODUCTION BY

SAMUEL UNTERMYER

LONDON : GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LTD.  
RUSKIN HOUSE, 40 MUSEUM STREET, W.C.1

COPYRIGHT IN THE U.S.A. 1924  
THE LEAGUE FOR PUBLIC DISCUSSION  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

*Printed in Great Britain*

## FOREWORD

MR. BENJAMIN A. JAVITS (Temporary Chairman) : Ladies and Gentlemen, we are met to-day to have presented to us a great question, one which of necessity must vitalize the thinking faculties of every man and woman here.

This is a great battlefield. This should be the only kind of a battlefield that thinking men and women should visit. It is to be regretted that a great many of the questions which face nations and human beings are not debated more often.

It is a pleasure, I am sure, and a privilege for all of us to have two noted men such as Mr. Scott Nearing (applause) and our friend from across the sea, Mr. Bertrand Russell (applause), take opposite sides of a proposition which undoubtedly is one that concerns every man, woman and child in the world to-day.

Your interest in the subject has brought all of you here. Those of you who came here with a set thought, or rather set thoughts and set convictions, for the side that Mr. Nearing is going to uphold, will

have the pleasure and privilege of being battered to a pulp by Mr. Bertrand Russell. On the other hand, those of you who have non-assailable notions and redoubtable reason for maintaining the position that Mr. Russell is going to hold up in this debate will have that valiant spirit or that valiant champion of independent thought and independent action, Mr. Scott Nearing, to contend with.

And those of us, or rather all of us, whether we have thought on one side or have made our decision on one side of the proposition or on the other side of the proposition—and I don't believe there are any here who haven't any thoughts at all—will have the pleasure and privilege of having the debate conducted by a man of international fame, of international reputation, and himself a great debater and a fighter for what he believes to be right at all times, Mr. Samuel Untermyer. (Applause.)

It is my pleasure to introduce to you the Chairman of the afternoon, Mr. Untermyer. (Applause.)

## INTRODUCTION

MR. SAMUEL UNTERMYER (The Chairman) :  
Ladies and Gentlemen, apropos of the statement of Mr. Javits that this sort of a war is the only kind of war that ought to be waged, I observe that the committee in charge of the arrangements have put the two contending debaters out of range. (Laughter.)

I congratulate you and I congratulate myself upon our good fortune in being permitted to participate in this battle of wits and mentality on a world topic with which we are sadly unfamiliar, between two of the greatest intellectual gladiators that ever faced one another in the arena of public debate. (Applause.)

Both are profound scholars and thinkers. And, above all, both of them have shown their supreme confidence in their capacity and willingness to sacrifice possessions, social position, liberty and life, if need be, in the defence of their convictions. (Applause.) Both of them are men of vision with hearts overflowing with sympathy for their fellow-men. And both of them have been old



and tried men in the battle of reason. They are both renowned writers upon the most abstruse subjects within the radius of human thought, and they both speak in the language of world-statesmanship.

The subject that they are to debate is one worthy of their great talents. Its title is : "Is the form of Soviet Government applicable to Western civilization?"

It is a problem the answer to which is fraught with great importance to all of humanity. Our dense ignorance on the subject in this country is a just reproach and a veritable travesty upon American institutions. A mass of information or scraps of information, I might say, and misinformation have, from time to time, trickled through to us in a way that has simply added to our confusion and bewilderment.

It is therefore with sincere pleasure that we grasp and welcome this opportunity to be informed by educators and logicians of the real facts, by men who are profoundly versed in those facts. I hope that the time has come when all this selfish, partisan propaganda to-day has ended with respect to this great subject, when we shall have reached the stage in which we have open minds, and that this occasion will be the

beginning of an educational campaign that will enable the American people to pass intelligent judgment, so that they may guide the officials in charge of our public affairs and correct any injustice that is born of ignorance or provincialism, or both. (Applause.)

Quite apart from the question to be debated of whether or not the Soviet form of Government is adapted to Western civilization—upon which I express no opinion and upon which it would be highly improper for me to express an opinion, provided I had one—I have never been able to understand the basis on which our Government has persistently refused the recognition of Russia. (Applause.)

That Government has maintained and strengthened itself over almost a decade now against internal and external attacks, misrepresentation of all kinds and discouragements that would have overthrown almost any form of Government. (Applause.)

If it is a stable, organized Government, its form, or the social or economic basis on which it is founded, is none of our business. (Applause.) We have always recognized monarchies and despotisms, however revolting they were to our institutions or to our

conceptions of Government. We are ourselves maintaining subject-countries such as the Philippines and Porto Rico. And this high virtue and the pedestal on which we stand smacks very much of hypocrisy pure and simple. (Applause.)

If our persistent refusal to recognize the present Government of Russia is based upon the fact that it is unwilling to assume the obligations of the Czarist regime, the pretext is equally insincere. If the refusal to entertain or the ignoring or the failure to meet obligations is a form for refusing to recognize a Government, we had better hurry up and withdraw our recognition of a number of European Governments. (Applause.)

There may be some to whom our government of the Philippines and Porto Rico is quite as objectionable as the method of the Government of Russia. However, this whole subject will now be brought into the open. And the sooner it is brought there and the more rapidly it is determined, the better it will be for our self-respect.

We are standing in the rear whilst Government after Government is recognizing the present Government in Russia, and we are offering nothing but flimsy and insincere pretexts for so doing. (Applause.) I hope

that this debate will bring sharply to the attention of the people of this country the question of the proper regulation of our foreign affairs. And, in saying that, I am not intending to reflect upon one administration any more than upon another. This is not a political speech. (Laughter.)

The order of the debate will be (as your programmes have told you) that Mr. Scott Nearing will open the debate on the affirmative of this issue and will speak for thirty minutes. He will be followed by Mr. Russell, who will speak for thirty minutes. Mr. Nearing will then counter for twenty minutes—I mean academically counter—and Mr. Russell will close the debate by speaking for twenty minutes.

I now beg to introduce to you a man who, by his courage and high patriotism, has endeared himself to that part of the thinking people of America who differ from him quite as much as to that which agrees with him. Mr. Scott Nearing. (Applause.)



AFFIRMATIVE PRESENTATION ADDRESS

SCOTT NEARING

SCOTT NEARING, born in Morris Run, Pa., was educated in the Philadelphia public schools, from which he graduated in 1901. He attended the Law School University of Pennsylvania 1901-2; received the degree of Bachelor of Oratory from Temple University, Philadelphia, 1904, Bachelor of Science in Economics, Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania, 1905, and Doctor of Philosophy there in 1909. Student in summer school, University of Grenoble, France, 1920.

He was secretary of the Pennsylvania Child Labour Committee, 1905-7. Instructor in Economics in the Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania, 1906-14; Assistant professor 1914-15; Instructor in Economics, Swarthmore College, 1908-12; Instructor in Sociology, Temple University, 1906-7; Lecturer on Social Science, Chautauqua, (N.Y.) summer schools, 1913-17; Professor of Social Science and Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, Toledo University, 1915-17; Lecturer in Economics and Sociology, Rand School of Social Science, 1917 to date.

## AFFIRMATIVE PRESENTATION ADDRESS

MR. SCOTT NEARING : " Is the Soviet form of Government applicable to Western civilization? " By Western civilization I presume that we mean Western Europe, Canada, the United States and those other portions of the world which have during the last century or two directly adopted the economic and social forms of European civilization.

In maintaining the affirmative of this question, I desire to present at this time three points. First, what is it that makes a particular form of Government applicable? Second, what is the Soviet form of Government? Third, why do I believe that it will fit Western civilization? And if I succeed in answering or in explaining those three points adequately, I will have succeeded in building up an affirmative of this question—Will the Soviet form of Government prove applicable to Western civilization?

First, then, what is it that makes a form of Government applicable to a particular



situation? Forms of Government correspond with certain stages in social evolution. Europe furnishes an excellent example of this general proposition. For example, if you go back a thousand years in the history of Europe, practically the entire continent was under the domination of a form of Government which has since been described as the feudal system or the feudal state.

The feudal system was a system of landlordism under which one part of the population owned the land which was worked upon by another part of the population. The part of the population which owned the land—that is, the landlord element or landlord class—ran the political Government because it ran the economic system.

At that time throughout Europe this feudal form of Government was applicable to European civilization. It was based economically on agriculture. It was based socially on a class division, primarily into a class of land owners and a class of peasants. I therefore suggest that at this stage of the development of European Government the character of the occupation of the people, the agricultural character of industry, was the primary determinant of the form of Government.

In this form of Government, or in this

form of society including this form of Government, there was the beginning of another form of Government. One by one there sprang up what were known as the free cities. These were centres first of commerce and later of handcraft industry.

Into these centres there came people from all parts of Europe and Asia, settled down, took up various branches of commercial and industrial life, and formed the second type of Government that Europe has produced in the last ten centuries—a form of Government built on commerce and on the beginnings of modern specialized industry.

And one by one these cities grew up, not alone in one part of Europe, but all over Europe, from east to west and from north to south. The free city Government grew up where industry and commerce grew up. And in this second form of Government we have a second example of the general proposition that forms of Government correspond to stages in social evolution.

The free city, that is, the centre of commerce and industry, expanded. Britain became a commercial and industrial country—Belgium, Holland, France, Germany, Northern Italy and so on following. And as this change occurred in the form of

production, in the form of life, as agriculture was pushed more and more into the background and commerce and industry took its place, a third form of Government arose which we call the bourgeoisie state.

In one case, in England, it took the form of a limited monarchy. In another case, in France, it took the form of a Republic. But essentially the basis of the state remained the same. It was organized in the interests of certain commercial and business classes. It performed their work and did their bidding. Hence, we have a third illustration of the general proposition that the forms of Government follow the lines of social evolution.

As I said at the outset, these forms have appeared in all parts of Europe—not at the same time, because feudalism lasted in some parts of Europe longer than it lasted in others. But when feudalism gave place to industry and commerce the feudal state merged into or evolved into the modern capitalist state.

I take these illustrations and make this detailed statement because I wish to found my whole argument on this major proposition: that the forms of Government correspond to the stages in social development. They do not correspond to ethnic qualities.

They do not correspond to linguistic units. They do not correspond to any of the racial or religious differences that are ordinarily alleged as the lines of demarkation between nationalist groups. The forms of Government do correspond to certain forms of economic and social evolution. The stage at which Europe now is is this stage of the capitalist state. We ordinarily call it nation.

Why did the Soviet form of Government then appear in Russia? These things do not happen. They correspond with certain stages in social evolution.

Parenthetically, let me say here that forms of society sometimes die, break down, disintegrate, disappear. Feudalism disintegrated and disappeared thus in France toward the end of the eighteenth century. Forms of society break down and disappear. And various causes induce this breakdown. Sometimes they break down through internal decay. Sometimes they break down through the impact of external forces. The breakdown of the old Roman system was due to both forces, decay from within and attack from without.

Russia, a country which is still eighty-five per cent. agricultural, retained the essential elements of feudalism into the

twentieth century. And therefore into the present century there came the old feudal bureaucracy of Russia—a group of landlords running a country stretching over eight millions of square miles and a vast population of one hundred and thirty millions, most of them peasants, and all of them under the thumb of this little landlord bureaucracy.

Those of you who have read Russian literature, Gogol, for example, or any of the other satirists of Russian life, or those of you who are familiar with Russian history, know that the Russian bureaucracy was not efficient. It was centuries old and it had failed to develop with the evolution of the rest of Europe. It had held Russia back, keeping it agricultural, keeping it feudal, fending off the evolution that had gone on in Germany, in Belgium and England and in other capitalist countries.

But with the beginning of the present century there began in Russia the new business life. And the revolution of 1905 was essentially a movement of the Russian businessmen to shake themselves loose from the millstone of bureaucratic inefficiency that was hanging about their necks. They, too, wanted a chance to use the coal and the iron and the oil and the timber of Russia as the

businessmen in other countries had done. And since the Czar and his ineffective ministers tied them up with red tape, they were anxious to get the Czar put in a position where he couldn't interfere with legitimate business enterprise.

So that Russia in the opening years of the twentieth century was partly feudal—the Czar was a feudatory monarch—and partly adolescent capitalist. The Russian business life had just begun to show its head, just begun to feel the rising tide of its power. Russia was thus between eras neither feudal nor capitalist.

And when the war struck Russia, it destroyed both feudalism and capitalism. The Bolsheviks did not destroy the Russian ruling classes. The Russian ruling classes destroyed themselves between 1914 and 1917 through their inability to mobilize and to handle their military and internal life. The people of Russia starved. They lacked clothing. They lacked machinery. The railroads broke down. Fuel was scarce. The whole life of Russia from 1915 to 1917 was in chaos. And, finally, when early in 1917 the Russian armies began to quit and go home, it was because the Russian people were convinced that the whole business wasn't worth going on with. And they

were convinced of that because they were hungry and cold and sick and war-weary.

That is what happened in Russia. The old order—partly feudal, partly capitalist—crumbled under the blows of the war. And when Kerensky came into power in March, 1917, he came into power in a bankrupt country with the transport and industry wrecked and the army everywhere in full retreat.

Russia in 1917 had lost more heavily than any other belligerent country because of its inefficiency, because of its incompetence. And the breakdown of Russia was the breakdown of an established social order under the crushing weight of two and a half years of war.

Therefore, when the old order broke down, since there were a hundred and thirty million people who had to go on living, they rustled around and found a new order. The Soviet form of Government is the first expression of that new social order. And it came in Russia because the old social order broke down first there. If the old social order had broken down first in Germany, the new social order would have come first in Germany. If it had broken down first in England, it would have come first in England. The old social order ceased to work in

Russia, and the hundred and thirty millions of people there had to have something. And they adopted a new form, and that form we call the Soviet form of Government.

What is the Soviet form of Government? That is the second question I want to present. I have tried to explain why it is there. What is it? I suppose Mr. Russell and I will not differ on this point. We can hardly do so at this stage of the game. And so I imagine that I can define it very briefly, and I shall set out with that in view.

The Soviet form of Government is a temporary or transition form to bridge over the abyss between capitalism and socialism. The Soviet form of Government is not a socialist or communist Government. The Soviet form of Government is a transition Government. It is a bridge over an abyss, working toward communism and away from capitalism.

It is highly centralized, therefore. It is in the form of a dictatorship. This dictatorship is exercised by the delegates of peasants and workers—originally of soldiers, peasants and workers; now of peasants and workers—and is dominated by the communist party, which consists of about six hundred thousand men and women who have in view some-



thing which they describe as economic emancipation of the producing classes.

That means the elimination of all exploitation, that people shall own their own jobs and control their own product and decide what policy industry shall follow, just as we are entitled to decide what policy politics shall follow. I am not saying, understand, that they have this in Russia. I am saying that this is the goal or objective of the communist party: To establish communism. No communist asserts that they have communism in Russia. All of the leading communists are on record as saying that they have not communism, particularly under the new economic policy.

Russia, the Russian form, the Soviet form is a dictatorship under the control of the industrial workers, primarily—not of the peasants, although the peasants participate—a dictatorship dominated by the communist party aiming at economic emancipation.

Three outstanding characteristics differentiate the Soviet form from our form of Government. First, local constituencies are economic and not geographical. The Soviet of Moscow is elected by street car workers, school teachers, steel workers, building trades workers—not by residents of the first,

second, third and fourth assembly districts as in New York. (Laughter.)

The basis of representation is economic or occupational, and not geographic or regional as under our system. I believe that constitutes one of the great contributions of the Russian system, because life to-day is divided most sharply along occupational and not most sharply along geographic or regional lines.

The second outstanding characteristic of the Soviet Government is its proposition to organize economic life as we have organized political life. In the Middle Ages, political life was in the hands of little princelings and dukes and one kind of ruler and another. We have taken that chaotic localized political form and unified it under a federal, state, city, county, borough, village, system of administration.

Our political life in England and Germany and the United States and Canada and Australia is scientifically worked out, planned, blue-printed. The Russians propose to work out, plan and blue-print economic life. We still let little bankers, manufacturers and other private profiteers and enterprises carry on their private bucketeering activities in economic life. The Russians propose to eliminate profiteering in economics as we

have eliminated profiteering in politics. That is their second great contribution—to scientifically organize the economic life of Russia.

Their third essential contribution is contained in the phrase which they quote in their constitution: "He that will not work, neither shall he eat." Under our system of society the biggest owner gets the biggest return, though he may make no contribution to society. But because he owns property, he has great income.

Under the Soviet form, their fundamental law, their constitution asserts that such a man can't even vote or hold office, but that the rights of the country are restricted, the political rights, to those who perform productive and useful service.

Those, in my judgment, are the three characteristics that differentiate the Soviet form from our form. First, economic occupational constituencies. Second, the scientific organization of economic life. Third, the necessity of every able-bodied adult to render some service to the community.

This form is the product of seven years of war, civil war, famine, disease and hardship. The Russians have beaten this form out of the very flesh and marrow of their lives. They have put into it millions of

lives and tens of millions of living units of suffering agony, while we have been going to the movies and living on the fat of the land. The Russians have hammered this thing out of their necessities.

When will it fit Western civilization? Not now. When did it fit Russia? It fitted Russia when the old order broke down. It will fit Western civilization when the old order breaks down. If peace and prosperity and progress are the outstanding characteristics of Western civilization, the Soviet form of Government will never fit Western civilization. If peace and prosperity and progress can be maintained in England and France and Belgium and the United States, the Soviet form of Government will never fit. If, on the other hand, international war and class war and hard times break down the fabric of Western society, then the Soviet form will be inevitable.

And my whole argument centres around this proposition: that the Soviet form of Government is a transition form of Government between capitalist society and socialist society, and that when capitalist society breaks down we will have the Soviet form of Government.

What are the chances that capitalist society will break down? I suggest that you

read Mr. Bertrand Russell's latest book, *The Prospects of Industrial Civilization*. (Laughter and applause.) If you are still unconvinced, a fellow countryman of his, Sidney Webb and Beatrice Webb, these two have prepared a book called, *The Decay of Capitalist Civilization*. And if you are still unconvinced, Signor Nitti, ex-Premier of Italy, has written a book, *The Decadence of Europe*.

Any one of the three books, I think, is sufficient to convince any intelligent man or woman of the inevitableness of the presence of decay in European society, and all three together I think will be intellectually convincing to any person who is still capable of developing new lines of thought. And if, perchance, you are not yet convinced, I suggest that you read the Dawes Report. It is only fourteen thousand words long and not bad reading. And in the Dawes Report there are the germs of enough future wars, international and class wars, to destroy any civilization that ever existed, let alone the civilization of Europe. (Applause.) We are getting ready for the next international war now. On every envelope that you get out of the Post Office, it says, "Let's go, Citizens Military Training Camps."

International war, class war, civil war and hard times are the three battering rams that are destroying your civilization. And although you happen to live in the richest country in the world, and although you happen to live on the easy side of life, and although things seem to be going well with you now—the Germans felt the same way in 1913. And that is only ten years away. And ten years hence a lot of you will be singing a different tune, if that is the tune that you follow at the present time.

So I say all over Western Europe when capitalism breaks down, as it must, there will be the dictatorship of a group of industrial workers under a highly organized and sternly disciplined party like the communist party in Russia, and they will build a society based on economic constituencies, and they will organize under engineering scientific direction the economic life of the world, and we will have a new social order which we might call communism or socialism, but the transition stage to that new social order will be characterized by the essential characteristics of the Soviet form of Government. (Applause.)



NEGATIVE PRESENTATION ADDRESS

BERTRAND RUSSELL



HON. BERTRAND A. W. RUSSELL, F.R.S., 1908 ; M.A. ; late Lecturer and Fellow of Trinity, College, Cambridge ; heir present to 2nd Earl Russell ; born at Trelleck, 18 May, 1872 ; second son of the late Viscount Amberley. Educated at Trinity College, Cambridge (scholar) ; 1st class in Mathematics and in Moral Sciences, Part II. *Publications* : " German Social Democracy," 1896 ; " Essay on the Foundations of Geometry," 1897 ; " Philosophy of Leibniz," 1900 ; " Principles of Mathematics," 1903 ; " Philosophical Essays," 1910 ; " Problems of Philosophy," 1911 ; (with Dr. A. N. Whitehead) " Principia Mathematica," 1910 ; " Our Knowledge of the External World as a Field for Scientific Method in Philosophy," 1914 ; " Principles of Social Reconstruction," 1917 ; " Mysticism and Logic," 1918 ; " Roads to Freedom," 1918 ; " Introduction to Mathematical Philosophy," 1919 ; " The Practice and Theory of Bolshevism," 1920 ; " The Analysis of Mind," 1921 ; " The Problem of China," 1922 ; " The A.B.C. of Atoms," 1923 ; " Prospects of Industrial Civilization," 1923.

## NEGATIVE PRESENTATION ADDRESS

THE CHAIRMAN : I confess to a certain discomfort at these prophecies that Mr. Nearing so eloquently put. But those of us who have advanced along the road in life have still something to hope for in an early death. (Laughter.) I am also hoping that the great logician from whom you are now to hear will have something to say on this subject, and may have a prophecy of his own from which we may get a little more comfort, even though we don't get any more knowledge. (Applause.)

MR. BERTRAND RUSSELL : Ladies and Gentlemen : It is a serious task which Mr. Nearing has set me, the task not only of trying to cheer up your spirits, but to try to prove that possibly there may be some reason for hope that we may survive the dangers which he portrays and which I regret to say, as he pointed out, I have myself on occasions portrayed in somewhat similar colours. (Laughter.)

Now the question, to my mind, is not : Do we run a risk of destructive wars, do we

run a risk of the collapse of our Western civilization? I am prepared to concede to him that we do run that risk, that there is a real danger, if we do not learn to control our warlike activities, there is a real danger that this civilization that we have inherited may perish. That, to my mind, is not the question that we have to debate.

The question we have to debate is this : Are we likely either through a cataclysm or in any other way to see a Soviet form of Government adopted in our Western countries? I believe myself that whether we have a cataclysm or whether we do not, in either event we shall not have a Government analogous to the Soviet Government of Russia.

Now I might argue that, if I liked, upon Mr. Nearing's own premises. I do not wholly accept his premises; but since they will allow my conclusion, I will accept them for a moment.

Mr. Nearing told you, following the teaching of Karl Marx, that the form of industry in any society determines the form of Government. Well, the form of industry in Russia at the time of the Bolshevik revolution was exceedingly different from the form of industry in this country or in my own—exceedingly different. You had capitalism only in its infancy, capitalism just

beginning. You had peasant industries. You had handicrafts. You had a whole primitive system.

I don't ask you to believe me. Read the words of Lenin in advocating the new economic policy. Read how he sets forth what a progress Russia would make from the condition it was in in 1921 if it advanced to the stage of capitalism. Those are the words of Lenin.

Now he is pointing out how much primitive industry, how much handicrafts, how much peasant proprietorship and the rest there is in Russia. He is pointing out how far Russia is from the technical development that you have in Western countries. And, therefore, if we accept Mr. Nearing's principles, we should expect to find that the form of Government suited to Russia would be something quite different from the form of Government suited to ourselves.

And, in fact, you do find that. The Soviet form of Government is almost exactly the same, down to the minutest particular, as the form of Government established in England by Cromwell in the seventeenth century. That form of Government in England belonged to a somewhat similar stage of economic development.

It is true you did not have, as you have in Russia, certain beginnings of modern capitalism. You did not have railways, you did not have oil or mines. Those things developed at a later date. But you did have a population, most of whom could not read and write. You had a feudal system in decay. You had a middle class gradually arising. And you had in the Government established by Cromwell the very thing which is typical of the Bolshevik revolution. You had what Cromwell called an army of saints. That army has been called in Russia the Red Army. It is the same thing.

I am not maintaining that every soldier in the Red Army is a saint. But I do say they have this in common with the army of saints: They were in their origin chosen for their opinions. You have now in the Red Army men of all opinions, but you have them controlled by men who belong to the communist party. And in the origin of the Red Army it was the communist party which made the nucleus of it, just as in Cromwell's army it was the convinced Puritans. And the whole movement of the Bolsheviks in Russia is, to my mind, quite extraordinarily analogous to the movement of the Puritans in England in the

seventeenth century, arising in the same way, because it arose at a certain economic stage to upset a system more archaic than any capitalist aristocracy.

Now that seems to me what you would expect on Mr. Nearing's principles. You would expect that the form that would arise in a Russian revolution would be quite different from that which would arise in a revolution in this country or my own. I am not saying that it is impossible that we shall have a revolution here or in my country. Under the circumstances set forth by Mr. Nearing, I think it extremely probable. A revolution occurs in a country when its Government is defeated in war. Now I don't think your Government is very likely to be defeated in war. But you can't tell. My Government, of course, might be. (Laughter.) In that case a revolution would occur. But I do not believe that the revolution would lead to a Government at all analogous to that of Soviet Russia.

Mr. Nearing described the form of Government in Soviet Russia in terms which I partially accept, but not wholly and entirely. He spoke of a centralized dictatorship by delegates from peasants and workers, dominated by the communist party. Well, these delegates from peasants and

workers do not really count in the Government. The essential thing in the Russian Government is that it is a Government by the communist party, just as Cromwell's Government was a Government by the Puritan party. It is a Government, that is to say, by people having certain opinions.

There is a form of election which is gone through occasionally. But that is an empty form. You have open voting. And everybody has to vote or, if he doesn't vote, he has to put up his hand to show that he is not voting. And as the Government watches the proceedings, it is a difficult matter to go against the Government. Moreover, propaganda against the Government or for an opposition candidate is not permitted. That is to say, the opposition cannot speak in halls or have literature.

Therefore, in effect, these elections do not count. What you have in effect is a Government of the communist party. Mind you, I am not criticizing what is done in Russia. I do not want to put this argument on the basis: Are the Russians right or are they wrong? I want to put it on the basis: Is the right thing for them the same as the right thing for us? That is quite a different question. And I should like to associate myself most whole-

heartedly with the words of the Chairman in regard to the recognition of the Russian Government and the right of the Russians to choose their own Government as they like. I am glad that that was said from the Chair in order to make it clear that that is no part of the matter in debate this afternoon.

The matter in debate this afternoon is simply this question: Can we regard what has happened in Russia as a model for what is to happen in the West? I think there are a great many reasons why we cannot. I have spoken about the reason which I think Mr. Nearing ought to accept, the fact that Russia is at a different stage of economic development. But there are, to my mind, other reasons.

Mr. Nearing accepts the position, which I suppose one must regard as orthodox in the Marxian world, namely, the position that economic causes alone determine the form of a society. I cannot myself admit that for one moment. I think that religious causes, ethnic causes, causes of inherited culture count for a very great deal in regard to the form of society.

If you compare the civilization of Russia with the civilization of China, you find practically no economic causes of difference



whatsoever. I am talking of their traditional civilizations as they existed until recently. Yet, in spite of that absence of economic causes of difference, you find the most profound differences of civilization in the two countries. The Russian civilization is religious, persecuting, centralized. The Chinese civilization is free-thinking, decentralized and quite unpersecuting. You have a profound difference resulting, to my mind, from a difference of tradition and a difference of temperament. And I think the difference between the Russian tradition and the Western would always make it very difficult for us here in the West to adopt anything that had been adopted in Russia.

In the past, as I was saying before, two hundred and fifty years ago, we could try the things they are now trying in Russia. A long tradition has accumulated over us since that time. The whole of the eighteenth century with its scepticism, its criticism, the whole of the nineteenth century with its optimism—all those things have gone over us. They have altered our outlook. They have made us quite different in our ways of viewing things from the Russians.

Now it is one of the common boasts of the Bolsheviks, and it is repeated by their admirers, that they are scientific. It is

impossible to imagine anything more totally false. A man of science is a man who is—I don't mean each particular man of science, for there are many of them who are not scientific—but the man of science as he should be is a man who is careful, cautious, piecemeal, empirical in his conclusions, who is not ready with sweeping generalizations, who will not accept some large doctrine merely because it is fine and symmetrical and synthetic, but will examine it in its detail and its application.

Now that is not the way with those who follow Marx on the question of the economic determination of history. There is dogma, a dogma set up in the name of science. It reminds me extremely of the dogma set up by Comte under the name of positivism, also under the name of science. August Comte, as you all know, proved that the whole world would adopt his doctrines before the end of the nineteenth century. Well, as a matter of fact, the nineteenth century was just about finishing when the last of his followers died. (Laughter.)

Marx's fate has been more fortunate than that. But I am not at all sure that the world is going to develop on the lines which Marx laid down, lines of schemetic simplicity more simple than any human affairs

ever are, leaving out a vast complexity of human material, leaving out the quality of slow growth in societies.

After all, we know that one individual is different from another individual. Two men will grow up in exactly the same environment. One will adopt one occupation, and another will adopt another. One will succeed; another will fail. So with nations. They may have the same economic environments and yet they may differ very profoundly.

The Marxian formula is too simple. The world is not made so simply as that. And when you hear anything sweeping, when you hear anything catastrophic, when you hear anything that projects a glorious future in some golden age, well, I think it is well to be reminded that such doctrines are by no means new. There have been the Mille-narians, the Seventh Day Adventists, The Latter Day Saints, the Christadelphians, there have been a host of these people who represent that after some catastrophic revolution you are going to have a millenium.

That, I say, is not a scientific view of human society. And I think what has happened in Russia is extraordinarily conclusive against that view. They had in Russia the revolution which they demanded.

They had the revolution which was to introduce complete communism with all its benefits.

Mind you, I am not arguing against communism. I am arguing against the belief that it is going to come about in this catastrophic fashion.

Well, they had their revolution. And after they had had it, and after they had tried for four years to carry out the policy for which they had made it, they had to go back to the New Economic Policy involving only those parts of socialism which even the most moderate socialists accept.

And, in the meantime, they had had a Government quite extraordinarily like the old Government of the Czar, far more like than it was said to be by most of its Western admirers—a Government centralized in Moscow, depending upon secret police who were the very same men who had been the secret police under the Czar, depending upon secret arrests, imprisonments and even executions without trial, continually concerned to suppress insurrections and to prevent assassinations, a Government opposed by the great bulk of the population. That was the situation that you had in the early days of the revolution. It is not the situation now. It is not the situation now

because they have adopted the New Economic Policy. And having adopted the New Economic Policy, they are getting away from that transitional form, and they are beginning to get towards something which may be really a step towards communist government.

Mr. Scott Nearing suggested that one of the great things about the Russian revolution was the attempt to introduce justice and equality as between man and man. Now that is a very great ideal, and it is one we have got to strive towards. It is not one which was realized in the early days of the Soviet revolution or one which ever can be realized by methods of violence and by methods of force.

You had there a Government with tremendous powers, greater powers than any Government has ever had before in the world's history. And you had the bulk of the population subject to that Government, having to content themselves with what that Government would allow it. You had no justice. You had to a certain extent a degree of economic justice, only a degree of it, because the men in the Government undoubtedly did live better than the men who were not in the Government. But you did have a degree of economic justice.

You did not have any degree whatever of political justice. Certain men held political power and certain others did not. And it rested with the men who held the political power whether they should take to themselves a larger share of the economic goods than other people or whether they should not. That is to say, the form of Government which was provided contained no safeguard whatsoever against economic exploitation, except the personal integrity of the politicians who ran it.

Well, we know something about the personal integrity of politicians. (Laughter.) And, although I do not like to say it, I believe that politicians are politicians in one longitude as in another. That is, to my mind, one of the great difficulties about this method of transition by revolution.

Then there is another point. You had in Russia an inefficient monarchy and an inefficient aristocracy. You have in this country no monarchy and a highly efficient aristocracy. (Laughter.) You have an aristocracy of men who have risen mainly by their own abilities, men who have achieved enormous power, executive men, men who are accustomed to controlling great affairs, who are liable to lose their position if they are foolish—an aristoc-

racy totally unlike the feudal aristocracy of Russia.

And I say to you, if you attempt as the Russian Bolsheviks did, if you attempt while you are a minority of the country to pit yourselves against your aristocracy, you will find it a very different task. You will find, unless you can win the majority of your country, that that aristocracy in your country will beat you. It is not a thing that can be done—to beat an efficient aristocracy when you are a minority against it. You must first win the people.

In Russia that was not necessary. In Russia the people are apathetic. The Bolsheviks have discovered a great thing, a thing of immense importance, and that is how to take the next step in the countries of Asia, among which I include Russia.

In those countries you have an intelligentsia, you have a collection of educated people accustomed to the ideas of the West, and determining out of national vanity that they will not admit that anything applicable in the West is not applicable in the East. They commit, to my mind, the converse error to that of which I am accusing Mr. Nearing. They think, if this system is good for the West, it must be good for the East.

That is not so. You have in the East

enormous uneducated democracies, an enormous bulk of the population not knowing how to read or write, totally ignorant of political events, hardly knowing even that they belong to a country. Those men are not capable of exercising democracy. And if you are going to take the next step from autocracy or from any ancient evil in a country of that sort, you cannot take it by the line of democracy such as we have in the West.

The Soviet leaders have discovered another line—that is, the Government of a certain political party, the Government of a certain group of intellectuals. And I am inclined to think, as a transition stage, that is the very best that you can have. I do not believe that there is a better way of making the transition from the old autocracy to the new democracy. As a transition in an uneducated country I think the Bolsheviks have chosen probably the better way.

As a method in a country like yours or mine, where people are accustomed to participation in politics, where they are accustomed to think about public events, it is a totally impossible method. It would not be the communists who would secure the Government of this country or of mine if



there were a scramble and an appeal to force. You know what happened in Italy. It was not the communists in Italy. The methods adopted were the same as those of the Bolsheviks. The people who emerged were the Fascisti. If you tried the methods tried in Russia you would find equally that it would be the Fascisti who would emerge. I mean by them the people to whom I alluded a moment ago as your aristocracy. Those would be the people who would secure the power, and you would not get a step towards that ultimate goal that we all desire.

Where you have your population able to read and write and participate in politics, you must adopt a different line from that which has been adopted in Russia. You cannot do it in the same way. The Russian system is one inherited, if I may say so, from the Byzantine, the whole tradition of the Greek civilization, the whole tradition of the Eastern Roman Empire.

You had in the Eastern Roman Empire an emperor who was omnipotent, and who had under him the patriarch of Constantinople, who led the religious life of the community. In the West you did not have that, because in the West the empire fell and the Pope became independent of the State. You had in the West the conflict

of the State and the Church, leading ultimately to a certain degree of freedom. In the East you did not have that. The Church was subordinate to the State, and you got despotism.

You have the same thing under the Bolsheviks. The Bolshevik regime represents the State, and the Third International represents the Church. And the Third International is subject to the regime of the Bolshevik Government. You have a Byzantine tradition of centralization and despotism, a tradition from which people with our Western tradition are separated by a great gulf.

Wherever you have that Western tradition of the separation of Church and State, you cannot run a theocracy such as the present Government of Russia. The whole Government of Russia at the present time is an outcome of Eastern tradition. It belongs historically with the orthodox church.

I know that Mr. Nearing will be shocked with me for bringing in considerations that are not economic. But I am perfectly persuaded that the Marxian dogma that economic things are at the bottom of everything is exaggerated. They are at the bottom of much, but not of everything. And when you try to simplify to that extra-

ordinary extent, you are not being scientific. You are no more scientific than would be a man who said, "All the movements of bodies are due to the force of gravitation, and to no other whatever." Many of them are due to that. Others are due to other forces.

So it is with society. And the claim that that view of life is scientific is not compatible with a knowledge of scientific method. Take one sole point about it. It is fixed for ever in the sacred word of Marx. It cannot be changed. It has all the marks of an ancient orthodoxy. Many things have been discovered since the sixties. Many things have come to be known since Marx wrote. Those things have to be decreed as unimportant, because they are not in the sacred text. That is not an attitude which can be called scientific. It is an attitude which you find in Russia. It is an attitude belonging naturally to what I should call the theological outlook. And I say the domination of the Bolsheviks in Russia is a theological stage in development and anything but a scientific stage.

It is not all the same thing to say, here is a doctrine which is scientific, and actually to be scientific. The man who is scientific is tentative. He is cautious. The man

who tells you, "Here is something which is absolutely and eternally true because I can prove it by science," contradicts himself because science does not believe in the possibility of obtaining eternal and unalterable truth.

And that is why I do not think that the real progress of the world is achieved by the revolutionary methods. I think the real progress of the world is a more patient thing, a more gradual thing and a less spectacular thing. And I think a good deal of the desire to imitate Russia, which exists among our Western radicals, is due to the delight in what is spectacular, due to the desire to think that results can be achieved quickly from one day to the next.

They cannot. Results in Russia are only now beginning to be built up as the revolutionary ardour ebbed. During the revolutionary ardour you had a necessary phase. You did not have the actual construction of those organs of economic life which are necessary if you are going to carry out socialism. The things attempted to be built did not succeed, partly because of war, partly because of discontent, partly because of disaffection. But all those evils were the products of revolution, and revolution brings them inevitably with it.

And if we have these terrible cataclysms in the West which Mr. Nearing spoke of (and which I am not prepared to say we shall not have), if those cataclysms come to us, they will not issue in the establishment of communism, they will not issue in the establishment of socialism or of capitalism or of anything else at all. They will issue in the return to barbarism. They will issue in the destruction of our industrial system.

Communism, capitalism, are both of them forms of industrialism, and both presuppose a certain kind of civilization. Both alike are incompatible with the state of destruction and starvation and barbarism which you will have if these great cataclysms come upon us in the West. So far from having communism, you will have a state where we shall have to return probably to hunting animals with bows and arrows, where a few of us will lead a precarious existence upon the wild fruits of the earth. That is the sort of thing that you may expect if we go on with wars.

Russia has been able to some extent to build up again. Why? Because other nations survived, because when the worst was over, other nations have been able to supply Russia with her needs. But if the leading nations all at the same time are

engaged in a cataclysm of that sort, there will be no one to help them out. There will be starvation. A vast percentage of the population will die. The rest will grow savage through the difficulty of keeping alive. And the whole thing that we have built up will simply go.

That is the danger that you have to face. You have to face the thought that it is very easy to destroy what we have, and it is very hard to make sure that that will be succeeded by what we want. And that is why I do not think that this form of Government which has been adopted in Russia is a necessary stage for us here in the West. We have to make our transition by other methods in other ways, more gradual ways, less spectacular ways. Our days for the spectacular, our days for the dramatic, to my mind, are past. We have gone through that stage, and the time has come for solid work and slow work and a gradual building up bit by bit. That is my belief about what it is necessary for us to do if we are to realize the hopes which Mr. Nearing and I equally share. (Applause.)

The Chairman: There will now be a ten minute recess to enable us to think for ourselves.



## AFFIRMATIVE REFUTATION

THE CHAIRMAN : Mr. Nearing, now having recovered his second wind, will speak twenty minutes. (Applause.)

MR. NEARING : Mr. Russell started out with the promise of cheering you up. When he left you, he had you hunting mountain lions with bows and arrows. (Laughter.)

Like a good philosopher, Mr. Russell divides life into categories. I never mentioned Karl Marx, but what I said he labelled Marxian, and then he proceeded to hammer Karl Marx. Well, now, I have no objection to having what I said called Marxian. But I didn't say it because Marx said it. I said it because I believe it was true. When I asserted that the form of Government corresponds with the stage of social revolution, I proved it not by quoting Marx, but by quoting history. And if Mr. Russell wants to disprove it, he must disprove it not by quoting Marx nor arguing with Marx, but by arguing with my history.

Mr. Russell should distinguish between two very important elements in the Bol-



shevik situation. When I described them I described them in two categories. I described the aspects of power under the communist party, the dictatorship, and I also described the economic forms which the Soviet Government was realizing, namely, economic constituencies, the scientific organization of economic life and the demand that everyone should be rewarded in proportion to his service, not in proportion to his property.

The parallel between Cromwell and Russia holds as to the dictatorship. So does the parallel between Russia and Italy hold as to the dictatorship. You can take the Fascist movement in Italy and parallel it step by step with the Cromwellian or the Russian dictatorship. But neither Cromwell nor Mussolini has proposed any form of economic reorganization. (Applause.)

Now, says Mr. Russell, because Russia is still agricultural and the West is industrial, we can expect the forms to be different. I think so. The Russian leaders got their training in Germany and England and the United States and Switzerland and France, which are all industrial. And then they went back and tried to apply their theories of communism to an agricultural country, and they didn't fit exactly, therefore,

the necessity of the new economic policy. When those same policies are applied to an industrial country they will not fit without the new economic policy. (Applause.)

But that is not the difference between Mr. Russell and me. He says when you have a population able to read and write you cannot proceed in the Bolshevik way, you must find another way. I will drag into the debate, with apologies, a quotation from an article which Mr. Russell wrote in the *New Republic* on November 17, 1920:

"While admitting the necessity and even utility of Bolshevism in Russia, I do not wish to see it spread or even to encourage the adoption of its philosophy by advanced parties in the Western world."

And in another article in the same periodical on the 3rd of November:

"I am compelled to reject Bolshevism for two reasons: First, because the price mankind must pay to achieve communism by Bolshevik methods is too terrible and, second, because even after paying the price I am not sure that they will have what they went after."

Mr. Russell doesn't like Bolshevism; neither do I. Mr. Russell doesn't like war; neither do I. Mr. Russell doesn't like

dictatorship; neither do I. If Mr. Russell was going on a picnic on Decoration Day he wouldn't like a rain; neither would I—and yet it might rain. (Laughter and applause.)

Now this is the question that I want to ask Mr. Russell: When the crisis does come, which you admit, and which I believe will come, when the crisis does come, and when the British capitalist system breaks down, for example, what will be the form of the transition society? I don't insist that Mr. Russell produce a form, but I ask that he suggest a form.

And I'd like in that connection to call your attention to a remark of Mr. Ramsay MacDonald—Mr. MacDonald, whose present job is to prove that there is another form, and who hasn't yet proved it. Mr. MacDonald wrote a book in 1920 called, *Parliament or Revolution*. And in that book he says:

“So far as this country is concerned we have reached a stage when the socialist process, when the socialist programme is a matter of political fighting. A parliamentary election will give us all the power that Lenin had to get by a revolution.”

Now, note: “Of course,” says Mr. MacDonald in the same paragraph, “if it

came to be that we had a bankrupt country, a demoralized and disorganized people, and anarchy from one end of a ruined country to another, a committee of public safety might well step into Whitehall and make up its mind to impose a new order upon an old chaos." (Applause.)

Now that is exactly what happened in Russia in 1917, and that is exactly what happened when Cromwell took the reins of power in England in the seventeenth century. In other words, when one social system breaks down and another one has to be rebuilt, there is a transition stage during which a committee of public safety steps in and takes control and imposes a new order upon an old chaos. And that is what happened in Russia, in the first instance, and that is what will happen in England after Mr. MacDonald gets through with his present experiment. (Applause.)

Now I am not arguing, as Mr. Russell seemed to imagine, that we can meet the aristocracy of the United States to-day, known as the Rotary Club and the Chamber of Commerce. (Laughter.) I realize quite well that the American plutocracy not only has its fingers on American economic life, but that they have the political and the propaganda machinery of the country wholly

within their grasp. My argument did not concern that stage in social evolution. I argued that the present system would break down, and that when it did break down—that is, when the ruling class can no longer deliver the goods—then the change that I have suggested must come, not by Act of Parliament, but by the appointment of a committee of public safety.

Now that is the issue between Mr. Russell and me. It is up to Mr. Russell to show that when a breakdown does come there is another way out. I wish there was another way out. I wish that Mr. MacDonald's way was the way. I wish that people were intelligent enough in America to make economic and social changes by Act of Parliament. But I also wish that we wouldn't pass espionage Acts and lynch negroes in America—and yet they do it. (Applause.) You can wish all you like, you have got to face the realities of life as we have them.

Now, says Mr. Russell, the alternative is bows and arrows and barbarism. It is—provided that there is nothing to replace this miserable economic fiasco called capitalism when it breaks down. And if Mr. Russell's counsel prevails when the capitalist system breaks down, you will get

a stick and a knife and make yourself a bow and an arrow.

That isn't my idea of the way to handle that particular job. I believe that right now, before the capitalist system breaks down, when certain of us can see the breakdown coming, it is up to us, first, to say so, and then to gather together as many other people as can see it, and then to get together and work out a practical working programme to meet the breakdown and to put something else in the place of the old chaos, namely, a new order.

Mr. Russell has no objection to find with the communist philosophy. He has no objection to find with the socialist state. He only says it can't be done. Well, my answer to that is this : That nothing has ever been done till it was tried. (Applause.) And everything that has ever been done has been tried many times before it was done right. And if the Russians haven't found the right way, it is up to Mr. Russell and me to help Americans find the right way. (Applause.) All of this talk about bows and arrows and barbarism is merely a waste of valuable time. What we want is a practical statesmanlike way out of that tremendous difficulty.

Let me sum the thing up in this fashion :

We agree substantially as to the form of the Soviet Government. Will it fit the Western world? Well, first, will capitalist society break down in the Western world under the earthquake shocks of war and class strife and economic hard times? Mr. Russell thinks so, and so do I. That is our first point together. We believe that the capitalist system will fail. We believe it is failing now.

Second, what will take the place of the capitalist state, of the capitalist order. We both believe that it should be—and I believe that it will be—a socialist or producers state. And we go along somewhat together on that point.

Third, when the breakdown comes, will a highly centralized committee of action be necessary? I believe it will. Must it be under the direction of producers rather than of property owners? I believe it must. Must it be dominated by a highly organized and sternly disciplined party? I believe it must. Must it aim at economic emancipation? I think it must. And I think that it will have to do that by socializing the social machinery of production, resources, utilities, industries, merchandising and the like, by socializing and organizing industry, by establishing self-governing units orga-

nized on a basis of occupational representation, and that the first law must be : " He that will not help produce, neither shall he share in the products of industry." (Applause.)

Those are the transition steps, those are the economic forms which Soviet Russia is now trying to take. And I believe that those are the transition steps and those the economic forms which England and Germany and France and the United States will be compelled to take when the time comes.

In other words, all of these questions that I have just presented to you I answer in the affirmative. Mr. Russell answers some of them in the negative. Now I revert to my question. When the crisis does come—not whether we can fit the aristocracy now, not what Karl Marx said, not human frailty and incapacity—when the crisis does come to the hundred and ten millions in America and to the forty-five millions in Britain and the sixty-five millions in Germany and the thirty-five millions in France, when the crisis does come, what will be the form of the transition society, if it isn't the Soviet form? (Applause.)



## NEGATIVE REFUTATION

THE CHAIRMAN : Far be it from me to intrude into this debate. (Laughter.) It is a pretty enough fight as it stands. Thanks to the close and skilful reasoning of our intellectual gladiators, it seems to me that we have gotten down to an agreement upon everything except one point. And that is a point upon which Mr. Scott Nearing has the affirmative. (Laughter.) He must prove that the present form of Soviet Government is applicable to this hemisphere, not that all civilization is going to break down. (Laughter.) They agree about that. We are through with that. We may as well have that understood. But when it does break down, is that particular form of Government applicable to this country? And on that you want to hear Mr. Russell. (Applause.)

MR. RUSSELL : Ladies and Gentlemen : I am afraid I must begin by saying that perhaps our Chairman has unintentionally represented a somewhat larger measure of agreement between us than I think we might be quite willing to recognize. I think there

is still quite sufficient difference between us to keep up the debate. (Laughter.)

I feel inclined to congratulate Mr. Scott Nearing upon what I thought was a rather fine, a rather admirable example of question-begging. He assumed, in the first place, that our Western society is certainly going to break down, that that we may take for granted. He then went on to suppose that he could sweep aside as irrelevant the arguments that if that should occur, people would not be in the mood to introduce the Soviet form of Government.

Now I have two things to say, which are really only repeating what I said before. And that is this: First of all, I do not regard it as in any degree certain or even as more likely than not that our Western civilization will break down. It is merely one of those things that you have to take account of as a possibility. The art of prediction in human affairs is not advanced to that point where you can say such and such a thing will happen. And the man who tells you such and such a thing will inevitably happen thereby proves himself unscientific. (Applause.)

So I don't say our civilization will certainly break down, and I do not think it is at all certain. Further, if by any

chance it does break down in any given country, it will do so only as the result of defeat in war. Now, it is not very likely that all the Western nations will be defeated in war at the same moment. You may assume that some of them, at any rate, will be victorious. (Laughter.)

And in that case, in the victorious nations the capitalists will of course obtain a new lease of life. It will be the defeated nations which will want to go over to the new system. And I do not see—I will not say that it is with regret that I say this, but I do not see any near prospect of defeat in war for your country. (Laughter.)

I think it is extremely improbable that your country will be defeated in war at any time that we can look forward to. That being so, I do not think you will have a cataclysm in this country. And if you do not have a cataclysm, then you must find some other methods of transition to socialism.

Now Mr. Scott Nearing, in one of his remarks, which I shall regard as a begging of the question, represented me as saying that socialism cannot be carried out. I said it cannot be carried out by the Bolshevik method in the West. I did not say it cannot be carried out. I most firmly

believe that it can be carried out. But I believe it can be carried out only by gradual methods and not by the methods of revolution.

Revolution is applicable to societies at a certain elementary stage of development. But when they become so organic as our developed industrial societies have become, revolution means too much destruction. It would mean obviously, in the course of it, destruction of all our industrial plants, bombs dropped on power stations and all the rest of it, and it would mean that half our population would starve and the remainder would be unable to apply industrial methods because the industrial plants would be gone.

For those sorts of reasons, revolution of a violent kind is hardly applicable to an advanced industrial community. It is applicable to communities such as Russia was at the time when the revolution occurred. But it is not, I think, applicable with any advantage to highly developed and technically organized communities. They have to proceed by another route. And I say I will not so despair of human nature, I will not so despair of human intelligence as to suppose that you cannot persuade people in time of peace that the economic system we

have is not the best that there could be. I believe we can. If we are diligent, and if we are wise and eloquent and patient, we can persuade the populations of the Western world, even during peace and during prosperity, that the existing economic system is not best, and that they will do well to adopt the methods of socialism. (Applause.)

That is a slow task. I do not say it can be done in a day. But I say it can be done. And I say that any other method whatever, such as Mr. Nearing suggests, will not lead you to the goal.

He says it is futile to talk about bows and arrows. And at the same time, and almost in the same breath, he says we ought to face facts. Well, you can't have it both ways. If he wants to face facts, he must face the bows and arrows (laughter), because he thinks (and I do not think, and he did not argue this point), that you could survive a social cataclysm in our advanced countries and emerge with a highly organized and highly technical system of economic communism. I think that you would not emerge that way, because the destruction of life, because the struggle for existence during the cataclysm would be so terrible that men would not be in the mood for

any organized or rational form of Government.

He quoted Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, saying there would have to be a committee of public safety. No doubt there would. No doubt there would be a committee of public safety. But I do not see that committee of public safety in a position to establish the orderly works of peaceful, industrial production from one day to the next on a basis of communism, or indeed on any other basis. The whole machinery for industrialism would be swept away in the cataclysm, and you would have instead an agricultural community of peasant proprietors, because they alone would survive. That is the thing you have to expect if you proceed to wait for the cataclysm.

Now I say the cataclysm that Mr. Nearing alludes to can only be brought about by unsuccessful war. And there is one very simple way of dealing with that situation—do not embark upon war. (Applause.) Of course, if you embark upon war, it may be successful war. That is perhaps just a little bit better than unsuccessful war. But you can be quite sure that you will not get into an unsuccessful war if you do not get into a war at all. And that is the only way you can be sure.

And that is one reason why I preach to all the nations of the world to try to preserve the peace. I do not believe that through war you are going to arrive at these good results which Mr. Nearing has in mind. I believe that war is going to be more and more destructive and more and more to sweep away civilization and to take you further and further away from that scientific organization of industry which he and I jointly believe to be the goal. You are not going to arrive there by that method.

Mr. Nearing, I say again, invited us to face facts. Now I invited him to face the fact that there is no short and quick road to the millennium. You cannot get there through a fiery gateway that suddenly opens up into a happy valley. That is the sort of mythological conception upon which this whole idea is based. I don't think human society moves in that way. Human society moves towards good things slowly, towards bad things fast. (Laughter and applause.)

And so it seems to me that we have got to be patient in this matter. We have got to realize that if you are going to get to the sort of socialism that we wanted to see, that he and I both wanted to see, if

you are going to get the advanced industrial nations to adopt that (and it is useless for us to adopt it if they do not), then you have got to do it by peaceful propaganda. You have got to do it by persuasion, and you have got to do it in time of peace, and even in time of prosperity.

And that is a matter of appealing to people's intelligence. It is a slow matter, because people's intelligence is not so great as we could wish. But it will be a mistake to think they have none. I think his view of the situation is based upon too pessimistic a view of human nature. He assumes that you will never get people to improve their lot unless they are absolutely on the verge of starvation. Now that is not true at present of the people who already have a very fair amount of money. They are quite willing to take strong measures to get more money. Why should you assume that those who have less money will not become equally ready to take such measures? It is only a matter of getting the same energy and the same enterprise and the same imagination spread more widely throughout the population. And that is a thing which you may hope to see coming about.

We are only in the infancy of the industrial system. It is only a hundred years



since it began to exist in any modern form. A hundred years is a very short time in the life of the human race. Our habits are not adapted to it. Our thoughts are still agricultural, not industrial. It will take us a long time to get the habits of thought that are appropriate to the industrial methods. When we have those habits of thought, then I think we shall adopt the methods that Mr. Scott Nearing and I have in common.

But if you try to force them upon a population that does not understand them, if you try to seize the reins of Government in some moment of crisis and compel people to go in directions in which they do not want to go, your work will be the work of a moment, it will be swept away from one moment to the next and the whole thing will have to be begun again from the start.

That is why I compared the work of the Bolsheviks to the work of Cromwell. The Puritans had very noble ideals. They were very fine people. But their ideals were not those of the people. And after the people had experienced them for a little while, they said, "Never again." And that is what I am afraid will be said to communism in Russia, because it has been tried too soon. It is no use to try things until

people are more or less ready for them. You have got to develop, you have got to grow, people's thoughts have got to come up to the point where the thing is possible.

It seems to me that the outlook which Mr. Nearing represents—which I must not call Marxian (laughter)—it seems to me that that outlook comes from a time before biology had got the hold upon our thoughts that it has in our time. In the time of that author who shall be nameless (laughter), there was, as you know, a habit of following the philosophy of Hegel. Now Hegel's philosophy was logical, and it went by sharp transitions from this thing to that thing and then to the other thing and it was all a matter of hard outlines, sharp, rigid outlines, such as you get in logic.

Well, later on, after Marx's thought was fully formed, came the biological outlook which is associated with Darwin, a habit of viewing human society as a thing that grows, a thing that develops like a tree, a thing that has a life by itself, a thing that moves in a certain manner not prescribed by the laws of logic or reason, but prescribed by the law of life.

And I think you must remember that human societies are of that sort. You must remember that you cannot get human

societies to move in the manner of a logical transition, but only in the manner of a change in the way of life that must come gradually and bit by bit.

I know I have been accused, even here this afternoon, of being a logician. (Laughter.) I cannot deny it. I have sometimes pursued that study. But, in spite of having pursued logic at times, I do not think that logic is everything. And I think that when you are dealing with the development of human societies you must have some sense of life, you must have some understanding of how life grows, of the way that our feet have to be planted in the soil if there is to be anything real in our lives.

And I do find a lack of that in the philosophy which believes that by sudden revolutions everything can be effected. By sudden revolutions you can change the names of things, but you cannot change people's whole habits and movements. And you find that the old things come back with the new names. And that has always been the danger with revolutions.

You know how in the French Revolution you got not only the committee of public safety in the middle of it, you got Napoleon at the end of it. And the difference from

the old regime was nothing like so great as people would have had you believe. It is true they accomplished the establishment of peasant proprietorship, and that has been accomplished in Russia. I believe that to be probably the only thing that will permanently survive out of that whole revolution. And that could have been got with nothing like the expenditure of so much sorrow and suffering, with nothing like the tragedy in the life of Russia that has been involved in the revolution that has there taken place.

I am afraid that revolutions are a tribute to our sense of drama. We all have a sense of drama. We all have a love for the event which is noteworthy, which will be a fine thing on the screens. And we like to see things happening in that way, suddenly and finally and splendidly and heroically. But that is not the way that the really great work of the world is done. The great work of the world is a much less showy thing. And I believe that that will be so also with the introduction of socialism into our Western communities.

We might introduce the name by a revolution, but the reality we shall have to introduce by an evolution. And that is why I do not believe that the method

adopted in Russia is the method to be adopted in this Western country here or in my own country. I think that those who say that that is the method to be adopted are hypnotized by the great example of a nation at a different stage. We have come to a later stage, and we should not follow those who are still at an earlier stage.

I had that opinion when I came here. And, in spite of the extreme persuasive eloquence of Mr. Nearing, I still retain that opinion now. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN : And thus ends this great intellectual debate, with our best thanks to both participants. (Applause.)



GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LTD.  
LONDON. 40 MUSEUM STREET. W.C.1  
CAPE TOWN: 73 ST. GEORGE'S STREET  
SYDNEY, N.S.W.: 218-222 CLARENCE STREET  
WELLINGTON, N.Z.: 110-112 LAMBTON QUAY